

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,078	09/21/2001	Michal Lemaire	DN2001165USA	4361
75	90 10/05/2004		EXAM	INER
Howard M. Cohn c/o Ronald P. Yaist, Dept 823			KNABLE, GEOFFREY L	
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company		,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1144 East Market Street			1733	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/960,078	LEMAIRE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Geoffrey L. Knable	1733				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period work. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju	ly 2004.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2,4-10 and 21-32 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 8-10,21-24 and 30-32 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2,4-7 and 25-29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Expression is a specific to be supported to be a specific to the correction of the corre						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	<b>5</b>					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate. <u>10-1-2004</u> . Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1733

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. The information disclosure statement filed July 19, 2004 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because it lacks either a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e) or the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) and further fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).
- 3. Claims 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Black et al. (US 3,389,032) as applied in the last office action.
- 4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. (US 3,389,032) taken in view of JP 2001-247037 to Shimizu and/or Chouinard (US 2,336,596) as applied in the last office action.

Art Unit: 1733

- 5. Claims 7 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. (US 3,389,032) taken in view of Hoehn et al. (US 4,718,810) as applied in the last office action.
- 6. Claims 8-10, 21-24 and 30-32 are allowed for the reasons already of record.
- 7. Applicant's arguments filed 7-14-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Black et al., it is argued that

"Applicant respectively disagrees that the tire building drums of the '032 patent independently move along the rails, as set forth in independent claim 4. As stated on column 10 line 58 to column 11, line 29 of the '032 patent, each of drums has locking fingers that lock them together. Further, there is a line of interconnected drums designated as 8. Accordingly, tire building system of the '032 patent, specifically requires that the drums be interconnected and do not operate independently move along the rails."

This argument has been carefully considered but is unpersuasive. In particular, the portion of the Black et al. apparatus referenced by applicant is not the portion relied upon to reject the claims. It thus is not disputed that the drums are interconnected at part 7/8 of the apparatus. However, it is the later or downstream portion of the apparatus that is being relied upon, i.e. after the drums are *disconnected* from one another and each individually mounted upon a drum carrier "A". The drums mounted on the carriers are moved through the stations with the drum axis coincident with the working axis through the stations – note esp. "F", "G", "J", "K", "L", "M" in fig. 1 as well as col. 14, lines 19-22. Further, for reasons detailed in the last office action, independent movement is considered taught or obvious from the reference teachings. Reference is also again made to the evidence provided by Hoehn et al., i.e. that self-propelled

Art Unit: 1733

vehicles or automated guided vehicles (AGV) are well known and considered obvious in general in multiple station production environments. Thus, to provide even more independence of movement, the provision of self-propelled vehicles moving along the rails to transport the drums among stations rather than the non-self propelled vehicles/drum carriers "A" of Black et al. would have been an obvious alternative to the ordinary artisan and lead to only the expected results including enhanced production flexibility and versatility while somewhat simplifying the control/driving means for the drum carriers.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey L. Knable whose telephone number is 571-272-1220. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 1733

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on 571-272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Geoffrey L. Knable Primary Examiner Art Unit 1733

G. Knable October 1, 2004